

ITEMS RECEIVED AFTER THE PRODUCTION OF THE REPORT
FOR THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
TO BE HELD ON 15 DECEMBER, 2021

Page	Application	Location	Item No.	Description
P.38	2021/00622/FUL	81-85, Holton Road, Barry	1.	Comments from Cllr Ian Johnson missing from report
			2.	Comments from Cllr Neil Moore referring to representation received from neighbour
P.61	2021/01300/FUL	Ty Gerrig, Groes Faen Road, Peterston Super Ely	3.	Additional comments from Highway Authority
			4.	Comments from applicant regarding re-siting of fence to overcome highway concerns

MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 15 DECEMBER, 2021

Application No.: 2021/00622/FUL	Case Officer: Mr. Ceiri Rowlands
Location: 81-85, Holton Road, Barry	
Proposal: Part demolition, extension and conversion of the upper floors of no. 81 - 85 Holton Road to provide 25 no. affordable residential flats, together with internal and external alterations and associated works	

From: Cllr Ian Johnson

Comments:

The following comments were provided by Cllr Ian Johnson on 31st May 2021.

“Although the principle of upper floor housing above Holton Road shops is acceptable and welcomed, the proposal for 25 flats on this constrained site represents an over-development of the area - described in the Planning and Design Statement as 250 units per hectare.

I have concerns about the additional noise generated by this number of residents and the impact upon other local residents. Despite being a town centre location, the area is quiet after shopping hours.

I am concerned that the amount of space given over to waste and recycling within the site is insufficient for the number of anticipated residents.

Despite the town centre location, it should be anticipated that some residents will want to operate a motor vehicle. If the planning application is successful, the Council should consider options for this as the surrounding streets are highly over-subscribed with residential parking permits in operation, rather than just leave this to chance.

I reserve the right to make further observations on this planning application, including at committee.”

Officer Response:

The Officer’s report states in error that no comments relating to the merits of the proposal have been received by the local ward Councillors. However, the issues noted above have been considered in reaching the outlined recommendation for approval.

In relation to density, Policy MD4 (Housing Density) of the LDP states residential development should have a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare, unless a lower density is justified based on the policy criteria. There is no maximum density prescribed by this policy. Flatted developments such as this will be high density by nature and there is sufficient space within the building to accommodate 25 flats. It is stated within the

Affordable Housing section of the report that the Welsh Development Quality Requirements (WDQR) would be applicable to this development. These requirements include minimum internal space requirements.

In relation to noise, matters relating to anti-social behaviour is addressed within the Affordable Housing section of the Officers report. The residential use is not inherently noise generating and there was also no objection from Shared Regulatory Services in relation to noise disturbance.

The issue of parking congestion is addressed within Parking and Highway Safety section of the Officer's report. There was no objection from the Highways Authority in relation to parking congestion, who also administer the residents' permit scheme in operation nearby. There is an internal bin storage area provided and this is considered acceptable to serve the development.

Action required:

Members to note. No further action.

MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 15 DECEMBER, 2021

Application No.: 2021/00622/FUL	Case Officer: Mr. Ceiri Rowlands
Location: 81-85, Holton Road, Barry	
Proposal: Part demolition, extension and conversion of the upper floors of no. 81 - 85 Holton Road to provide 25 no. affordable residential flats, together with internal and external alterations and associated works	

From: Cllr Neil Moore

Comments:

The following comments were provided by Cllr Neil Moore on 14th December 2021.

"I have received a representation from a resident that I know personally and who lives in Newlands Street. She is very concerned about the above development, due to the lack of adequate parking in the area already.

I know that she works in the hospitality sector and when arriving home late at night she rarely if ever is able to park in the street as it stands at the moment. She has to park elsewhere and then move her car first thing each morning. I also believe that her husband and neighbours have registered to speak at the planning meeting and made representations, so I am sure they can give you first-hand knowledge and experiences.

Therefore, I would simply ask that Committee consider these concerns before coming to a final decision on the officer's recommendation to approve the development without any car parking available."

Officer Response:

The Representations section of the Officer's report provides a summary of matters raised in representations, including parking. These have been taken into consideration and the matter is addressed within the Parking and Highway Safety section of the report.

Action required:

Members to note. No further action.

MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE : 15 DECEMBER, 2021

Application No.: 2021/01300/FUL	Case Officer: Guy Watkins
Location: Ty Cerrig, Groes Faen Road, Peterston Super Ely Proposal: Erect a 5" feather edge fence to part of the front and the side of the property. The fence proposed is to be of the height 1.95 metres and will be behind the existing retaining wall	

From: Ahmad Asadi - Highway Engineer

Summary of Comments:

Supplementary comments received:

It is clear that newly built wall, obstructs the vision splay.

Groes Faen Road is derestricted road and without any traffic data, it is very difficult to understand the existing flows of traffic within the vicinity of the site, however, the road alignments suggest that the average speed could be lower than usual.

The build out section of the wall adjacent to the main road, is roughly 1.25m from the telegraph post and this section mainly is causing the vision splay obstruction.

Fencing above the wall (adjacent to the adopted highway) would further restrict the vision splays and as a result the Highway Authority would object to the proposal in the interest of highway / Public Safety.

For information, within the visibility envelope, no obstructions, inclusive of fencing and boundary walls shall exceed 600mm in height and any planting shall be located at the rear of the visibility splays.

The objection on loss of visibility is maintained.

Officer Response:

Comments noted.

Action required:

None.

MATTERS ARISING FOR COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE : 15 DECEMBER, 2021

Application No.: 2021/01300/FUL	Case Officer: Guy Watkins
Location: Ty Cerrig, Groes Faen Road, Peterston Super Ely	
Proposal: Erect a 5" feather edge fence to part of the front and the side of the property. The fence proposed is to be of the height 1.95 metres and will be behind the existing retaining wall	

From: Applicant – Miss Caroline Jones

Summary of Comments:

Applicant has proposed alterations, following discussion with the Council's Highway Engineer with regard what would be acceptable, as set out below :

- The fence would be set back by 1-1.25 metres from the retaining wall.
- The area in between the fence and the wall would then be landscaped with chippings

The retaining wall at the front of the property to be reduced height at the front to aid the visibility splay (between 600-800mm in height)

Officer Response:

Whilst the applicants proposed changes are noted, no plans or details have been submitted to fully assess the acceptability, or otherwise changes.

The Highway Engineer has responded, to the above, and states that as long as visibility splays are not obstructed (by the wall or the fence), the Highway Authority would accept the stated proposal.

Whilst the proposed amendments may overcome the highway safety concerns with the current development, in terms of the visual impact on the street scene in this rural setting, setting the fence back by 1-1.25 m, would still result in an unacceptable visual impact due to the height of the fence and wall in combination.

Action required:

None

Edgerton, Elaine

From: C J <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 10 December 2021 16:21
To: Watkins, Guy
Subject: Re: 2021/01300 Ty Cerrig

Hi Guy,

thanks for taking the time to speak with me earlier.
i have a brief update - and some very good news about the application -

i took the initiative to speak with Ahmad Asadi from the Highways authority after i spoke to you today (the chap that wrote the reports for the Highways department with regard to this application).
i explained to him the details about the boundaries etc and
we went through his initial report and the secondary follow up report.

I asked Ahmad what would be acceptable to his department and he told me that the Highways Authority would be satisfied if the front of the fence that is roadside was put back by approx. 1 meter - so instead of it being just behind the retaining wall it falls a little way back - thus improving visibility. He did not have an issue with the height of the fence, just that the front of the fence needs to be set back a little way behind the retaining wall so that people leaving the side road would be able to see properly when they are trying to pull out onto the road ahead. I am more than happy to do this, and agreed with Ahmad's proposed suggestion. Ahmad also said that the little portion of ground in between the fence and the wall should be gravelled over so that re-growth of the old hedge could be discouraged, also an idea that is fine by me, and I will fully comply with his suggestions for the proposal.

He said that they would be happy for the rest of the fence that travels down the private side road to remain just behind the retaining wall.

He then said that i needed to contact you to let you know, and as long as you were happy with this new suggestion to improve the visibility then the Highways Authority would also be fine with things too. I am to get back to Ahmad on Monday once i have spoken to you. Your phone is not currently connecting so i thought it best to email you instead as time is of the essence with this as i believe the Council are looking at the application on Wednesday.

If you can get back to me with your thoughts i would be grateful, and i can then lease with Ahmad as i promised again on Monday to let him know that everything is fine as long as i comply with his requests that i have detailed above.

i look forward to hearing back from you,
have a relaxing weekend,

kind regards,

Caroline.

Edgerton, Elaine

From: C J [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 December 2021 12:03
To: Watkins, Guy
Subject: Re: 2021/01300 Ty Cerrig

hi Guy,

thanks for getting back to me promptly.

i've just had a quick conversation with Ahmad and he feels the following is acceptable to the Highways department -

the proposed fence would need to be set back by 1-1.25metres from the retaining wall.
This is fine and acceptable to me.

the area in between the fence and the wall would then be landscaped with chippings with weed-preventing membrane so that there would be no re-growth of the old hedge and the soft landscaping would be low maintenance and attractive without reducing the visibility splay.
This is fine and acceptable to me.

Ahmad also said that the wall at the front of the property will need to be reduced a little in height at the front to aid the visibility splay.
This is fine and acceptable to me.

He tells me that on a flat road the wall would need to be between 600-800mm in height, but as the property sits on the side of a hill and the exit from the private road is higher than the small area of wall in question at the front of the house then this is fine to be increased to 900mm to 1 metre as it is a retaining wall - as long as the visibility splay when sitting in a regular car exiting the side road is not obstructed.
This is fine and acceptable to me.

as the portion of wall in question is also a retaining wall for the elevated garden within i also need to take into account the planning departments viewpoint on this where the wall needs to safely retain the garden within.

i will make sure that when i instruct the builder to reduce the height of the wall that he takes into account both points of view from the planning department and the highways department, so that compatibility and balance are achieved for both departments -

i will make sure that the wall is reduced to the correct level for sufficient visibility splay as the side road is exited as Ahmad has explained to me - to comply with the highways department wishes and that the wall is correctly and safely retaining the garden behind - to comply with the planning department requirements.
This is fine and acceptable to me.

if you need any further information/details from me Guy please do let me know.

i am happy to comply with the above information so that the property can be correctly and safely improved.

kind regards,

Caroline.